

**REMARKS****Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Otsuki, (U.S. Patent No. 5,847,685) (hereinafter "Otsuki").

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Claims 1, 4 and 7 have been amended to differently describe embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application. Claims 2 and 3 have been amended to improve the form of the claims. Accordingly, claims 1-9 remain pending and under consideration.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Otsuki. Applicants have amended claims 1, 4 and 7 to differently describe embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application's specification. To the extent that these rejections might be deemed to apply to the claims as newly-amended, they are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that in the previous responses filed to date in this application on September 9, 2004 and April 26, 2005, detailed arguments and explanations were presented regarding how embodiments of the claims of the instant application address particular deficiencies of prior art arrangements. Applicants note that these explanations are still applicable to this case. However, in light of the fact that the Examiner has maintained the previous rejections in a Final Office Action, and in light of the Examiner's comments in the Final Office

Action, independent claims 1, 4 and 7 have been amended to more particularly describe particular features of embodiments of the instant application consistent with those previously-filed arguments and explanations. Applicants have taken this approach in an effort to advance the prosecution of this case.

As explained in the previous response filed on April 26, 2005 in this application, the Background portion of the instant application discusses certain problems in conventional “in-dash” monitor arrangements. For example, in conventional arrangements, displaying of video on the display panel commences simultaneously with the commencement of the active state. As a result, the user will not see the entire program because the program commences a few seconds before the display panel is in its fully extended (unfolded) state for the user to view it.

Embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application are able to solve this problem of the conventional arrangements by prohibiting the video output signal Sav from being output to the display panel until the display panel is completely extended to an active state in which it is fully viewable by the user. In this way, the user will not miss any portion of the beginning of the video program because the program will not begin until a detection has been made that the display device has completely reached this active state. See, for example, step S18 in Fig. 5; page 15, lines 29-34; page 3, lines 1-4; and page 4, lines 8-12.

At page 7 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner alleges that “the claims do not recite what the applicant is suggesting as a solution to the prior art ... and, therefore, the claims have been interpreted in reasonably broad terms.” This assertion is respectfully traversed because the previous form of claim 1 clearly explained that the video signal is output upon detection “that the display device has been placed in the active state.” The “active state” is described in the

specification as a state in which the display device has been extended or unfolded. See, for example, page 4, lines 8-12.

Nevertheless, in an effort to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants have opted to further amend each of independent claims 1, 4 and 7 along these lines. For example, independent claim 1 has been amended to describe a display control apparatus combination that includes an opening device; a detection device; and “an output device for outputting a video signal to be displayed on the display device to the display device to cause the display device to display video based on the video signal;” and “an operation device through which a command to display the video on the display device is given by an input operation.” More particularly, claim 1 has been further amended to explain that “when the command is given by the input operation to display the video while the display device is being placed in the active state, the output device starts to output the video signal only after detection by the detection device that the display device has completely reached the active state.” Similar amendments have also been made to independent claims 4 and 7.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims clearly distinguish from the arrangements of the applied art. As recited in newly-amended independent claim 1, when a command is given by the input operation while the display device is being placed in the active state, the output device starts to output the video signal only after detection by the detection device that the display device has completely reached the active state. As a result, even in a situation where the command to commence video display is provided during the movement of the display device, the display of the video will not start until the display device completely reaches the active state. This ensures the avoidance of the above-mentioned problem in which a

user misses the beginning of a video program while the display device is in the process of extending to its fully active state. Applicants respectfully submit that Otsuki discloses or suggests nothing about this specific feature associated with embodiments of the instant application. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that it would not have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to start the display of the video only after a predetermined requirement is satisfied (in this instance, detecting that the display device has completely reached its fully-extended, active state). Even further, Applicants respectfully submit that it certainly would not have been obvious to delay the start of video display in this way even in a situation where a command to start the video display has already been given.

Independent claims 2, 5 and 8 relate to additional features of the instant application. As explained in the response previously filed on April 26, 2005 in this application, in conventional “in-dash monitor” arrangements, the display panel retracts back into the dash board when the ignition key is turned off. As a result, even when the video program is completed, the display panel continues to be in its extended, active, position. As a result, the display panel remains exposed and susceptible to possible damage from heat and sun, or other environmental effects.

As explained in previously-filed responses, embodiments associated with the instant application are able to solve this problem by retracting the display panel within the dashboard once the video program is completed. This enhances the protection of the display panel from environmental effects and also allows the display panel to be retracted back into its inactive state without the need for any user interaction. See, for example, step S1 in Fig. 4; page 16, lines 1-4; and page 4, lines 18-22.

Applicants provided a detailed traversal of the rejections of claims 2, 5 and 8 in the previous response filed on April 26, 2005 in this application. In particular, the Office Action merely refers back to independent claim 1 for its rejections of claims 2, 5 and 8. However, it is clear that independent claims 2, 5 and 8 have particularly important features that are significantly different from those recited in independent claim 1. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has maintained the previous rejections of independent claims 2, 5 and 8 once again by merely referring to the rejections of independent claim 1.

In the Final Office Action, at page 7, the Examiner merely states that “retracting a display within a dashboard is well known in the art.” However, this general statement does not address the above-discussed feature in that the display is retracted when a detection device detects “that the display of all the video has been completed.” It is this specific combination of features that solves the problem of prior art arrangements as discussed above. Such a combination of features is neither shown, nor even suggested, by the art of record. The Examiner goes on to assert at page 7 of the Final Office Action that this retracting feature “is not recited in the claims.” To the extent that this assertion might be maintained even after the instant amendments to independent claim 2, such an interpretation is respectfully traversed because independent claim 2 clearly recites that the display device is placed in an inactive state within a receiving device “when it is detected that the display of all the video has been completed.” Independent claims 5 and 8 describe similar features as independent claim 2 in this regard. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that it is clear from the wording of the claims, from the associated description in the specification and drawings, as well as from the extensive discussion in the prosecution to

date regarding this feature, that claims 2, 5 and 8 describe this feature, which is neither shown nor suggested by the art of record.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because Otsuki does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 1, 4 and 7 as amended. In addition, Otsuki does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 2, 5 and 8. MPEP § 2143.03 instructs that “[t]o establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 409 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).” Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent claims 3, 6 and 9 are allowable at least because of their dependence from independent claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 or 8, and the reasons set forth above.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants’ undersigned representative to expedite prosecution. A favorable action is awaited.

**EXCEPT** for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including

any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0573.

This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

**DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP**

Dated: December 19, 2005

By:



Paul A. Fournier

Reg. No. 41,023

**Customer No. 055694**

**DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP**

1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100

Washington, DC 20005-1209

Tel.: (202) 842-8800

Fax: (202) 842-8465